

1229

Exhibit 9

Review of Opponents submissions to Spruce Mountain Wind Project.txt
From: Warren Brown [Warren_Brown@umit.maine.edu]
Sent: Friday, September 24, 2010 3:53 PM
To: Hallowell, Dawn
Subject: Review of Opponents submissions to Spruce Mountain Wind Project

I have reviewed non-health related documents [3, 6-15, 30, 31] received from the Friends of Spruce Mountain Wind Project and the e-mail from Steve Thurston. I find nothing that changes my conclusions (SMWP resubmission peer review, dated July 23, 2010) for residents that live in Woodstock within close proximity to the proposed development.

My reviews of the Fox Island (June 1, 2009) and Oakfield (December 18, 2009) wind projects respectively are incorporated into this e-mail by reference.

Fox Island Wind Review Conclusion:

It's my opinion the Fox Island Wind Project noise assessment is essentially reasonable and technically correct according to standard engineering practices and the Department Regulations on Control of Noise (06-096 CMR 375.10).

The very modest elevation change between wind turbine towers and nearby residents is suggestive of vigorous wind masking noise from area trees during significant turbine operation, but potential compliance concerns exist for the nearest 6 protected locations, identified in this report as locations A-E. I will expand in the following comments/recommendations.

Ambient sound levels were measured and average daytime/nighttime values calculated disregarding sound levels during wind speeds 0-2 mph. The regulation speaks to limiting measurements during high wind speeds (12 mph or perhaps manufacturer specified limits for microphone windscreens), but not low wind speeds. The nearby protected locations are within a very quiet rural setting, easily observed from the data submitted with the study.

RECOMMENDATION -- require "quiet area" sound level limits: daytime -- 55 dBA, nighttime -- 45 dBA

Significant vertical and directional wind shear in the Gulf of Maine (islands included) is documented for elevations similar to proposed turbine project during winds from the southwest through southeast (as documented by the applicant wind rose data for spring through fall -- prominent wind directions for the proposed site.) Pubnico Point Wind Project NS ~150 miles east of Vinalhaven Island in the Gulf of Maine has documented occasional sound levels far in excess (of those predicted using standard methods (divergence, air absorption, ground, etc.) under these wind conditions.

These occasional periods of significant wind shear, may also produce amplitude modulations at +/-1 Hz in excess of 6 dBA

Oakfield Wind Project Review Conclusion:

...In addition to this proposed application, the reviewer performed a general review of the Stetson Wind Project data focusing particularly on a singular measurement location chosen for demonstration of the MDEP commercial wind turbine routine operation compliance measurement protocol [See Conclusion-(Peer Review) Rollins Wind Project Sound Level Assessment -- Peer Review April 6, 2009 (Rollins compliance protocol)]. The measurement location selected was near the center of a concave array of five line-of-sight turbines, ranging from 1300-2000 feet from the microphone position and varying in elevation from each turbine hub by 250-400 feet. Meteorological data was correlated between 10 m, and the closest turbine for correlation with sound measurements to achieve desired measurement conditions (> 60% maximum wind turbine operation (maximum sound power output) during light surface winds).

Review of Opponents submissions to Spruce Mountain Wind Project.txt
 The data was rigorously evaluated using the Rollins Compliance Protocol methodology for sound level equivalent, tonal and short duration repetitive sounds. The measurement period was characterized by prolonged stable atmospheric conditions. The Stetson Wind Project predictions were based on CADNA/A software, including numerous prediction assumptions (consistent modeling assumptions used by RSE for this proposed Oakfield site and numerous wind projects before this) and the addition of an uncertainty factor of + 5 dBA were 2-3 dBA less than predicted operating levels.

This singular ridge-top, wind turbine operating sound assessment was conducted under "worst case" array geometry, line-of-sight and meteorological conditions. The documented results support a "calibrated prediction model" which is representative of "sensitive receivers" at similar distances and elevations.

Conclusion - (Peer Review)

In my opinion the Oakfield Wind Project noise assessment is reasonable and technically correct according to standard engineering practices and the Department Regulations on Control of Noise (06-096 CMR 375.10).

The wind project prediction model based on CADNA/A software, based on the following prediction assumptions:

- individual wind turbine spherical wave fronts,
- mixed ground cover attenuation (general) and reflective water surfaces,
- atmospheric attenuation based on 10°C, 70% RH,
- no attenuation due to foliage or barriers,
- all wind turbines operating at maximum sound power output and
- all wind turbines operating under moderate downwind conditions simultaneously.

Incorporation of an uncertainty factor of + 5 dBA for maximum equipment specification potential inaccuracy under stable atmospheric conditions and measurement methodology uncertainties resulted in a reasonable prediction model that is conservative at times.

SDRS was not observed using a rigorous protocol under very favorable geometric and atmospheric conditions. A tonal sound was observed periodically at 3150 Hz, but did not result in a penalty that effectively changed findings.

Warren

Warren L. Brown
 Radiation Safety Officer
 University of Maine
 5784 York Village Building 7
 Orono, Maine 04469

Phone: (207) 827-6920
 E-mail: warren.brown@maine.edu